



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/690,386	10/20/2003	Allen K. Murray	355870.02301	2380

7590 02/09/2007
Allen K. Murray, Ph.D.
Glycozyme, Inc.
17935 Sky Park Circle, Suite E
Irvine, CA 92614-6321

EXAMINER

MOSS, KERI A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1743

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/09/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/690,386

Applicant(s)

MURRAY, ALLEN K.

Examiner

Keri A. Moss

Art Unit

1743

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 November 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 29,31 and 36 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 27,34,35 and 37-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 26-28,30,32-35 and 38 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☒ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's Response to the Restriction Requirement submitted November 16, 2006 is hereby acknowledged. Claims 26-40 are pending.

Election/Restrictions

2. Applicant's election with traverse of claims 26-36 in the reply filed on November 16, 2006 is acknowledged. Applicants arguments were persuasive and the claims have been rejoined.

Claim Objections

3. Claim **26** is objected to because of the following informalities: on line 8, "analysis" should be replaced with "analyzing." All subsequent uses of the word "analysis" should also be so replaced. Appropriate correction is required.
4. Claim **27** is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Removing the alcohol precipitation step does not further limit claim 26 but instead broadens it.

Art Unit: 1743

5. Claims **37-40** are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim *should refer to other claims in the alternative only*. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims have not been further treated on the merits.

Potential Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. Since claims 37-40 cannot be treated on the merits at present, Examiner wishes to advise Applicant on potential claim rejections that would appear once the multiple dependent claim issues are corrected.

7. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

8. Claim **38** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Neither the specification nor the claims teach how the method of claims 26-33 can be used to identify the plant gum in foods.

9. Claim **40** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it

Art Unit: 1743

pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Neither the specification nor the claims teach what differences are being identified nor how to identify those differences by analyzing a multimer pattern.

10. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

11. Claims **38-40** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

12. In claim **37**, it is unclear whether applicant is claiming an independent or a dependent claim. Examiner recommends rephrasing the claim to read "The method of claim 33 wherein the sample is waste water and the sample is analyzed for monitoring the presence of glycan oligomers as evidence of discharge of polysaccharides from domestic laundry activities or other processing of polysaccharide-containing material further comprising the step of analyzing the waste water...."

13. In claim **38**, it is unclear what is being authenticated.

14. In claim **39**, it is unclear what is meant by "source". What is a source? Is it a location? A type of plant?

Art Unit: 1743

15. In claim **40**, it is unclear what differences may be identified. What environmental or genetic factors can be identified? How does the method of claims 26-33 provide this information?

16. Claim **38** provides for the use of claims 26-33 can be used to identify the plant gum in foods, pharmaceuticals or a work of art, but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced. For example, how is plant gum identified? Does the carbohydrate distribution identify it? If so, how?

Claim **38** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd. v. Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

17. Claim **39** provides for the use of claims 26-33 to identify the source contribution of polysaccharides of plant or animal origin, but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced. For example, on what basis does one identify the source?

Claim **39** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd. v. Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

18. Claim **40** provides for the use of claims 26-33 to identify differences due to environmental or genetic factors, but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced. What steps are used to identify the differences?

Claim **40** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd. v. Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

Allowable Subject Matter

19. Claims 28, 30, 32-35 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 1743

20. Claims 29, 31 and 36 allowed. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The closest prior art Massiot, P. et al (*Changes in cell-wall polysaccharides of ambarella fruit during juice extraction and clarification*, Sciences des Aliments, Vol. 11 No. 3 pgs 477-89 (1991)) discusses analyzing samples of polysaccharide by following a cold water extraction with hot acid then neutralizing the acid extract, but the prior art does not teach or suggest following those steps with alcohol to make an alcohol precipitate.

Double Patenting

21. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

22. Claims 27 as well as claims 34 and 35 when then depend from 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims of prior U.S. Patent No. 6,562,626. This is a double patenting rejection.

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Keri A. Moss whose telephone number is 571-272-8267. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill Warden can be reached on (571)272-1700. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Keri A. Moss
Examiner
Art Unit 1743

KAM 2/5/07


YELENA GAKH
PRIMARY EXAMINER